

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

## PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

## INTEROPERABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,  
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee meeting commenced at 9:00  
a.m. in the Commission Meeting Room, 445 12th  
Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20554, David  
Buchanan and Steve Devine, Co-Chairs, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

|                  |          |
|------------------|----------|
| DAVID BUCHANAN   | Co-Chair |
| STEPHEN DEVINE   | Co-Chair |
| ROBERT SCHLIEMAN | Member   |

ALSO PRESENT:

|                 |                            |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| MICHAEL WILHELM | Designated Federal Officer |
|-----------------|----------------------------|

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

## C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

|                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Welcome and Opening Remarks.....     | 3  |
| Michael Wilhelm.....                 | 3  |
| David Buchanan.....                  | 4  |
| Approval of Agenda.....              | 4  |
| The "Operational Requirements,.....  | 5  |
| "Operational Plan Architecture       |    |
| Update," PSWIN                       |    |
| David Pickeral                       |    |
| Working Group 3: "Rules, Policy..... | 6  |
| and Spectrum Planning"               |    |
| Stephen Devine                       |    |
| Discussion.....                      | 10 |
| Subcommittee Action Items.....       | 25 |

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9:05 a.m.

MR. WILHELM: Due to security procedures, or the Health Department -- I'm not sure which -- you will not be able to go to the FCC cafeteria for lunch today. There are eating places across the street at L'Enfant Plaza. There's a hotdog stand on the corner. Either Bert Weintraub or Joy, who will be sitting over there, can direct you to either of those.

These security procedures will remain in effect tomorrow. So you will have to undergo the same process tomorrow of being escorted to the Commission meeting room.

So welcome to the 16th meeting of the NCC subcommittees.

One other reminder: This meeting is being transcribed. In order for the court reporter to do so, if you have comments from the audience, you must use that microphone that's on the stand that's in the center of the room.

John Powell is at the Software-Defined

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Radio Conference somewhere in New York and I assume  
2 having a good time, and taking over for him is Steve  
3 Devine and Dave Buchanan this morning.

4 Dave?

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you. I  
6 don't have much to add to that. Steve and I will  
7 try to keep this going for John.

8 I don't know if we have anyone who wants  
9 to sign up for the Subcommittee at this time or the  
10 Work Groups, but if you would like to, Bob Schlieman  
11 has the information up here.

12 The agenda, I think it was on the table  
13 back there. Does anyone have an issue with the  
14 agenda as we have published it?

15 (No response.)

16 If not, I'll declare it's adopted then  
17 through consensus.

18 I don't think we have any -- the minutes  
19 from Washington, the last meeting, we don't have.  
20 So I guess we can't do anything with that.

21 As you can see from the agenda, there's  
22 no document updates also. That's pending.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   So I think we can start right in on the  
2                   Work Group activity. There's really nothing going  
3                   on in Group 1, "Report Drafting," unless you have  
4                   something, Bob?

5                   MR. SCHLIEMAN: No, I'm still waiting  
6                   for material from John. He's promised me the files  
7                   that we have on the log.

8                   CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. The  
9                   "Operational Requirements, "Operational Plan  
10                  Architecture Update" from PSWIN, is there someone  
11                  that's going to address that?

12                  (No response.)

13                  I'm not sure why he put that on. Are  
14                  you going to do it? Okay, Dave.

15                  MR. PICKERAL: Dave Pickeral, Booz Allen  
16                  Hamilton, PSWIN program support.

17                  As a reminder, the Operations Standards  
18                  Position is now vacant because Kyle Sinclair, who  
19                  was with the PSWIN program, left. In fact, he left  
20                  the Department of Treasury and went to the TSA,  
21                  Transportation Security Administration. So that  
22                  position is vacant. At this point the PSWIN program

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 doesn't have any recommendation as far as anybody to  
2 succeed him, but that post being vacant, there isn't  
3 any report in that area.

4 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, thank you.

5 Working Group 3: "Rules, Policy and  
6 Spectrum Planning," I'm going to turn that over to  
7 Steve, and that's really where our biggest work is  
8 going to be today.

9 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Thank you, Dave.

10 Back in July, John asked -- at the last  
11 NCC meeting in May he had addressed some issues  
12 regarding interoperability outside of the 700 band  
13 that he felt that the Interoperability Committee  
14 should look into. In July he sent a letter out,  
15 basically an e-mail, indicating he wanted to develop  
16 some policy regarding some of the other established  
17 FCC-designated interoperability channels and  
18 assigned it to the Rules, Policy and Spectrum  
19 Planning.

20 What we've done is we've put together a  
21 proposal, recommendation, proposed rulemaking, to  
22 address some interoperability issues in all bands of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FCC-designated channels, starting, in particular,  
2 with the popular band, the VHF and UHF channels,  
3 VTEC and UTEC, as they're designated from 00348, the  
4 Third Report and Order, which basically indicated  
5 that the frequency coordinators they anticipated  
6 would develop a plan for these channels, the  
7 implementation and technical and operational  
8 parameters.

9 The frequency coordinators have  
10 basically indicated that they think those duties  
11 would be best left to an organization or a committee  
12 within the NCC that's already empowered with  
13 interoperability responsibilities. Taking that,  
14 John has decided we needed to move forward with it.

15 What we've done is put a proposal  
16 together addressing some standardization, some  
17 channel nomenclature, and some implementation  
18 parameters that could be recommended for increased  
19 interoperability in all bands, not just the 700  
20 band.

21 The other two issues we've addressed are  
22 some technical parameters for existing intersystem

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sharing frequencies established -- police, fire,  
2 mutual aid, and the like -- some minimum parameters,  
3 but primarily regional development, letting those  
4 regions implement successfully those channels they  
5 had already dealt with.

6 The other, third part of this is the  
7 expansion of the State Interoperability Executive  
8 Committee's authority to implement interoperability  
9 solutions within their states in all FCC-designated  
10 interoperability channels, not just the 700. I  
11 think that will do many things, one of which would  
12 improve the SIEC development and interest when the  
13 authority gets allocated to the SIECs to develop  
14 those parameters in the 800 channels, some of the  
15 VHF public host channels that have been designated  
16 interoperability. I don't know if there's been any  
17 movement on those whatsoever.

18 And I don't know how much nationwide  
19 there's been implementation on the VTEC and UTEC  
20 channels. Right now they're existing. They have a  
21 co-primary status with their adjacent wideband  
22 channels, but, quite frankly, there's no parameters

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1       which anybody can look to if they wanted to develop  
2       parameters for those.

3               So what we've done is we're going to  
4       make a recommendation to the Implementation  
5       Committee to accept some of our recommendations and  
6       forward them to the Steering Committee regarding  
7       some of the interoperability.

8               Quite frankly, we don't want to make  
9       this too cumbersome. We think the regions know best  
10      how to implement this spectrum and how to best  
11      utilize these things, knowing how to use current  
12      intersystem sharing channels as well as some of the  
13      new, multi-discipline channels the Commission has  
14      put out, in particular, 700 VHF and UHF.

15              In addition to that, the NTIA Red Book  
16      channels, NTIA has, to me, from a Missouri  
17      perspective, has indicated that they don't believe  
18      those channels are going to be widely available  
19      until the rebanding is complete in 2005. I would  
20      like to operate from the perspective that, if we  
21      could develop some mechanisms for successful  
22      interoperability and improved interoperability in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 VHF and UHF, that the NTIA Red Book interoperability  
2 channels would be brought towards that, to be  
3 included as an additional resource, to expand an  
4 existing successful system.

5 Those are some of the parameters we  
6 have. Certainly we'll take any comments or  
7 questions on this proposal in particular. I have  
8 some documents, some draft proposals. I don't have  
9 enough for everybody, I don't think, but I do have  
10 some up here, if one wanted to view those.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Do you want to  
12 pass them out? Shall we do that and share them?

13 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: It's been sent out  
14 on the listserver.

15 MR. EIERMAN: David Eierman, Motorola.

16 We went through the Guidelines -- this  
17 is related to interoperability channel names. I  
18 don't know, I just walked in, so I'm not quite sure  
19 where we are on this topic. But we went through the  
20 Guidelines, looked at what was in the Guidelines and  
21 all the appendices of the Guidelines. The channel  
22 names and numbers, and what channels they were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 associated with, had not -- you know, we proposed  
2 that in, I don't know, early 2001. They have not  
3 been updated for the Fourth Report and Order and  
4 Fourth MO&O.

5 So the table that is in Appendix A of  
6 the Guidelines, and I think there's three other  
7 documents in the Guidelines that referenced several  
8 hundred megahertz I/O channels, needs to be updated.

9 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Right.

10 MR. EIERMAN: Now I went through, and  
11 one of the issues is the numbering theme that Kurt  
12 Wells had proposed was based on like the Second  
13 Report and Order or something and doesn't  
14 necessarily make sense the way the channels got  
15 rearranged in the Fourth Report and Order.

16 So we need to look at realigning the  
17 channel numbers or renaming them. I don't know if  
18 we ever formally adopted labels for the 700 channels  
19 either. I do have some proposals for just straight  
20 numbering on who's channel 1 through 64. So if you  
21 want to see a copy of that, I can give you a copy of  
22 that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Yes, I think we  
2 need to make sure that we're certainly working off  
3 the most recent plan. There is some discussion as  
4 to whether or not the last two characters should be  
5 unique to the channel, regardless of whether it's  
6 been designated to a discipline or one of the  
7 general channels. In other words, each channel  
8 should be designated a unique number, regardless of  
9 how it's labeled.

10 If you take that practice and apply it  
11 to the intersystem sharing, established legacy  
12 channels, you're going to have a five-minute delay  
13 that's going to be in a high data figure, FTAC37,  
14 and I don't know if the embedded users in that  
15 discipline are going to be too receptive to that,  
16 quite personally. So that's where the road forks  
17 actually.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. HARASETH: Ron Haraseth, APCO  
20 International. I just wanted to touch base and  
21 expand a little bit on some of the things that Steve  
22 mentioned about the interoperability channels.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   In, let's see, July, the end of July, on  
2                   behalf of the PSCC, the Public Safety Communications  
3                   Center, our coordinating council, the four Public  
4                   Safety Coordinators issued a letter to the FCC, to  
5                   D'wana Terry with cc's to Michael Wilhelm. I just  
6                   wanted to make sure that Michael was aware of that  
7                   and had that letter.

8                   That indicated a response to some  
9                   wording in one of the FCC documents, the Third  
10                  Memorandum of Opinion and Order and the Third Report  
11                  and Order, as Steve alluded to, that the FCC had  
12                  indicated that the interoperability requirements for  
13                  certain channels would be left up, they assumed, to  
14                  the frequency coordinators to develop the  
15                  operational requirements.

16                  The frequency coordinators opted not to  
17                  do that. They determined that it was more  
18                  appropriate that it fall under the purview, as Steve  
19                  said, under the State Interoperability Executive  
20                  Committees.

21                  However, that being said, they also  
22                  included in this letter a statement to the fact that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all of the interoperability channels in all of the  
2 bands, VHF, UHF, 800 MHz, and 700 MHz need to be  
3 addressed as a block, as an interoperability block,  
4 and not just concentrate on the 700 or some other  
5 band.

6 Right now the FCC has indicated that  
7 there's several frequencies in VHF and UHF, as Steve  
8 mentioned, that are available for interoperability.

9 However, so far, there's been no work developing  
10 any type of standards for operation or naming  
11 convention or anything for any of those.

12 In conjunction with that, there's the  
13 VHF public host channels that Steve mentioned also  
14 that, according to the rules and regulations, are  
15 relegated to interoperability as well. No work has  
16 been done on those because there's been -- nothing  
17 has happened with those because there are no  
18 guidelines for their use.

19 What the PSCC recommends is that the  
20 Commission essentially charge the NCC with the task  
21 of including all the interoperability channels  
22 identified in the previous paragraphs that I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 referring to here, and the NCC's deliberations and  
2 their planning efforts associated with providing  
3 guidelines for state and regional interoperability  
4 planning. The PSCC, through its ongoing  
5 participation and membership in the NCC, pledges its  
6 support and will back such actions as participants  
7 in the NCC process.

8 We have taken this another step on our  
9 own, realizing that primarily the FCC is not going  
10 to include operational language in the rules and  
11 regulations for the use of these interoperability  
12 channels. We've gone through that with the 700 MHz  
13 already.

14 In conjunction with that, we have had  
15 some meetings, one particular meeting in Nashville  
16 at the National Conference, that several of us got  
17 together, John Powell, Steve, myself, Don Root from  
18 California, and there's some others involved as  
19 well. The concept we came up with was creating some  
20 sort of national effort to compile this information  
21 that Steve has presented to us today, along with  
22 guidelines for operational use that the State

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Interoperability Committees could come to and use as  
2 a resource in developing their plans.

3 If something like this doesn't happen,  
4 each state is going to go its own route and develop  
5 the use of these nationally-identified frequencies  
6 without having any commonality across state borders,  
7 which means interoperability will not exist across  
8 state borders, except by accident, you might say.

9 As part of that effort, we've created  
10 essentially a website. Right now it is residing on  
11 an APCO location. It will be moved after a meeting  
12 yesterday with NPSTC. NPSTC approved sponsoring  
13 through the -- what do they call the office in  
14 Denver, the NLECTC? -- the National Support Office.

15 They will actually take over the managing of that  
16 website.

17 Essentially, what it is is a general  
18 place where exchange of knowledge for the SIECs can  
19 take place, a place where they can sign up for a  
20 discussion group listserver, where the documents  
21 that we create as voluntary documents, these  
22 documents such as Steve has just distributed here,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 where they can be worked on and they can be accessed  
2 by the individual state SIECs and used in their  
3 efforts, on a voluntary basis, to develop their  
4 plans.

5 If they have these voluntary plans that  
6 we can provide, and through the effort that we're  
7 working on here, I'm sure that the possibility of  
8 interoperability across state lines will be greatly  
9 enhanced.

10 So what I would like to ask is that the  
11 NCC, and eventually the Steering Committee,  
12 recommend and support the use of this mechanism and  
13 also the FCC to some degree. There's no obligation  
14 on the part of the NCC or the FCC involved in this.

15 It's just supporting the principle behind it. That  
16 way, I think it can benefit everybody.

17 If I can answer input on that, we can  
18 let everybody know, but we'll get out over on the  
19 general listserver just exactly where the final  
20 website location is and how to sign up on that.  
21 We'll also take APCO and NPSTC and any other  
22 organizations, we'll provide them the information

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 where that is to get that information out to the  
2 SIECs.

3 We have in one document that I provided  
4 yesterday to NPSTC included the information on the  
5 FCC website as to who all the contacts for all the  
6 state SIECs are. So we have that information. We  
7 will also get this information out to those people  
8 as well, but we do seek the support of the NCC in  
9 this effort.

10 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Thank you, Ron.

11 One of the other things I wanted to  
12 point out is these recommendations, we're not naive  
13 enough to think that they're going to be done  
14 exactly as they're written on paper. However, the  
15 repository, as Ron mentioned, would be a mechanism  
16 for somebody to see what they're using in certain  
17 states and be able to exchange that information. We  
18 see a direct correlation between education and  
19 awareness and compliance which will inevitably bring  
20 increased interoperability in all bands.

21 MR. PICKERAL: Dave Pickeral, Booz Allen  
22 Hamilton, the PSWIN program.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just want to take a moment to cite one  
2 of the experiences that the PSWIN program has had  
3 working with SIECs. Because SIECs are invariably  
4 going to be creatures of the state law of the  
5 individual states, it's very difficult to create a  
6 single model for one and say, "This is how you do  
7 one," because it's going to be subject to the  
8 political and economic and a bunch of different  
9 forces within the state.

10 So the benefit of having a single  
11 repository where you can look at several examples  
12 and pick what's going to work best for you and what  
13 your legislature and your courts and your governor  
14 -- it's critical. There is no one single model. So  
15 I think this would be a good idea to have this  
16 resource.

17 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. Well, I  
18 think we've got two things we need to do here. One,  
19 we need to take up Ron's proposal and see if we have  
20 -- we'll get some more discussion on it, but see if  
21 we have consensus to support it out of the  
22 Implementation Subcommittee to the NCC Steering

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Committee.

2 Basically, Ron, are you saying, you're  
3 just looking for general support of the concept of  
4 NPSTC being the repository of this information?

5 Okay, that's one issue.

6 The other thing that we want to come to  
7 consensus on is this proposal for numbering of all  
8 of the interoperability channels, updated by Dave  
9 Eierman's corrected -- I think basically this is  
10 more up-to-date --

11 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Absolutely,  
12 absolutely.

13 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- and labeling.

14 Now the labeling, just to be clear, we're proposing  
15 to ask the Steering Committee to recommend this to  
16 the FCC to be put in the rules. There's already  
17 labels in the rules, so we're not asking for  
18 operational items, but it is real important that  
19 everyone uses the same label for a channel.

20 I am sure everybody has some horror  
21 stories. I know the one from California was a fire,  
22 I think it was the Laguna fire in Orange County a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 couple of years ago, when LA City came in, and  
2 Orange County operates at 800 and they had the  
3 ICALLS and ITAC channels. LA City also has them,  
4 but they didn't call them the same name. They  
5 didn't have any idea that they could talk together,  
6 just because the names were different. That's the  
7 part we want to really go after and make sure that  
8 that's not an issue in the future.

9 So that is our other proposal here  
10 today. Eventually, Steve, I guess we've got to get  
11 down to also the usage of the wideband data.

12 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Right.

13 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But we'll take  
14 that up as a third item, even though it's part of  
15 this proposal.

16 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So is there any  
18 more discussion on --

19 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: I've just got one  
20 more thing.

21 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, go ahead,  
22 Steve.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Well, being a  
2     realist, I have realized that the sheet that Dave  
3     handed out here, the last two characters of all the  
4     channels are a unique, two-digit number. If that  
5     process is applied, as I indicated earlier, in the  
6     legacy intersystem sharing channels, police, mutual  
7     aid, 154.280, 265, 295, et cetera, that had been  
8     limitation 15 or 19 in the rules, if we do that and  
9     separate these channels out by discipline, there's  
10    going to be common embedded-use frequencies. Then  
11    we can have a unique number on the end of them;  
12    that's probably not going to be conducive to local  
13    use.

14                   So I'm somewhat concerned about this  
15    unique number being tagged on the end of a VHF  
16    channel that's been used for 35 years under certain  
17    name. It's a little different when you're talking  
18    territory at 700 that doesn't have an embedded base  
19    yet. So I'm somewhat concerned about that.

20                   In the proposal I had reclassified those  
21    as TAC1, TAC3, TAC2, et cetera, but it got up to be  
22    TAC37. I think that's going to reduce compliance to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some degree. So I'm concerned about that  
2 personally.

3 But any comments on that at all with  
4 regard to the labeling scheme applying to both  
5 legacy channels and recently-developed, multi-  
6 discipline channels, and the complexities therein?

7 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Can you give an  
8 example? Are you talking about maybe fire or  
9 something --

10 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Right, 154.295, if  
11 you continued the numbering scheme that was listed  
12 here, you would go -- well, it goes up to 63, and it  
13 will go higher than that. In other words, 154.280  
14 could be 1FTAC64. I see that as being, if you don't  
15 restart in the band with one, I think that is going  
16 to reduce compliance to some degree.

17 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Personally, I'm  
18 not sure it matters at all. For instance, in  
19 California -- I picked on that one just because I  
20 happen to know it -- that would be a fire white. So  
21 it is not going to be anything close to this.

22 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: The argument was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the discussion that we had in Nashville was  
2 that, if one only heard the last two numbers, you  
3 would know which channel. I think we would be  
4 losing more by going with that type of mechanism  
5 with regard to the embedded use than what we would  
6 be gaining by somebody just hearing the last two  
7 characters and being familiar with what channel that  
8 was designated with. So I'm certainly open for  
9 comments on that, but I have reservations about it  
10 personally.

11 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Robert Schlieman.

12 I would support your position on that.  
13 I think that it should be restarted within each  
14 band. We start the band with the band nomenclature  
15 digit, and it seems reasonable to restart the  
16 sequential numbering in that regard.

17 MR. DEVINE: One of the other  
18 initiatives we did was developed some aggregation  
19 procedures, working with Dave with regard to the 50  
20 KHz interoperability channels, on this proposal. I  
21 believe it's the last appendix that indicates some  
22 aggregation rules for the 1850 KHz channels.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1                   We came up with a maximum eight-  
2           character label, 7WDAT1A through 1G, all the way up  
3           through 6A, B, and C, indicating 50 KHz use for each  
4           of the three channels, the aggregation schemes  
5           between the two and the name associated with that,  
6           and the 150 KHz aggregation and the name associated  
7           with that.

8                   We also determined that channels 82, 83,  
9           and 84 should be permitted 50 KHz use with no  
10          aggregation and 91, 92, and 93 should be established  
11          50 KHz nationwide channels, also with no aggregation  
12          between the 50 KHz channels. That is a  
13          recommendation we made.

14                   Dave?

15                   CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So we need any  
16          discussion on that, and we need to come to a  
17          consensus on that proposal also.

18                   I think why don't we start off first  
19          with, as the Interoperability Subcommittee, do we  
20          have a consensus to support Ron's proposal to  
21          basically support NPSTC being a repository of  
22          operational guidelines for all these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interoperability channels? Does anyone have any  
2 more comments? Is anyone against that?

3 (No response.)

4 Okay, then I think we have a consensus  
5 there. So we will report that to the NCC Steering  
6 Committee.

7 The next issue, then, is the numbering  
8 for all the interoperability voice channels. I'm  
9 going to leave off Appendix C for right now. Is  
10 there any more discussion? Anybody have some more  
11 comments on this proposal?

12 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Any comments on the  
13 naming convention, some of the mechanisms we used to  
14 establish those, or the numerics involved?

15 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Robert Schlieman.

16 Going to the seven OTAC, I think any  
17 display on a radio, it might be confusing between  
18 the letter "O" and zero. I would suggest there be a  
19 different character for that. I guess you're trying  
20 to differentiate between general in the public  
21 safety block as opposed to the other public service  
22 support. My only problem is the letter "O" and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 zero. Would it be better to use maybe "S" for  
2 "service" or something?

3 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: I would say that's  
4 probably a good choice.

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, we'll make  
6 that change, if you don't have a problem with it.

7 "S" for just "service."

8 Anything else?

9 (No response.)

10 Does anybody oppose this numbering plan  
11 or the intent to submit it to the Steering Committee  
12 and ask them to submit it to the FCC for a  
13 rulemaking?

14 (No response.)

15 Okay, I don't see any opposition. So it  
16 looks like we have consensus on that.

17 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Can I ask a question --

18 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Sure.

19 MR. SCHLIEMAN: -- about these inland  
20 channels? Is that included in this motion?

21 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes.

22 MR. SCHLIEMAN: What is the purpose of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the "D" on the end, "D" as in "dog"?

2 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Talk around, the  
3 output, "direct."

4 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Okay. Because in the  
5 description it didn't say that. It's just an  
6 observation.

7 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, we'll get  
8 that corrected also, then.

9 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: I believe "direct"  
10 is also used in the 700 mechanism.

11 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Yes, it is.

12 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: It's a talkaround.  
13 We're looking for consistency.

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: We also need to  
15 take up Appendix B. Let's go to the wideband data  
16 first, since we've already talked about it.

17 Appendix C, then, is there any comment  
18 on that? We have designated -- and this needs to be  
19 brought out. We recommended, and the Technical  
20 Subcommittee adopted it, that most usage would be as  
21 50 KHz channels. Actually, what will be built into  
22 the radios, or what we're asking that it be mandated

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be built into the radios, that we adopted last  
2 time is -- and this was in the Technical  
3 Subcommittee -- that it would be 50 KHz wide and it  
4 would be the 16 QAM modulation, the mid-band or  
5 middle-of-the-road modulation for these channels.

6           However, as we discussed it, we wanted  
7 to have some flexibility in there that people could  
8 aggregate them within a region and use them up to  
9 150 KHz. We got a little concerned that we just  
10 don't want to lock everything as 50 KHz because, if  
11 applications come along that need wider bandwidth  
12 and more throughput, then that's going to be  
13 required or that may be needed in the future. We  
14 didn't want to just get so rigid with this that  
15 there wasn't some flexibility in it.

16           However, I don't think we're asking that  
17 this become a mandate that all radios have to be  
18 capable of 150 KHz-wide usage for wideband data  
19 interoperability. The only thing that we would ask  
20 that be mandated is the 50 KHz.

21           But it would allow, on a regional basis,  
22 that you could aggregate them and use them for some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 special uses. It could be on-scene uses that needed  
2 just more bandwidth, for whatever reason, video or  
3 whatever. So I wanted to point that out in this  
4 proposal. We would expect that most of the time the  
5 channels would be used as 50-KHz wide.

6 Is there any discussion on that or any  
7 other discussion on Appendix C?

8 MR. WILHELM: Could you amplify on the  
9 reasons for not permitting aggregation on 82, 83,  
10 84, 91, 92, and 93?

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: The reason for  
12 that is we wanted to have a group of channels  
13 nationwide that were 50 KHz only. We're envisioning  
14 that those would be prime candidates to build out  
15 nationwide in the future, that anybody could go to  
16 those channels with their radio, not needing  
17 anything special, and be able to send messages, if  
18 we can get the whole mechanism.

19 We are going to be talking about the  
20 addressing and some of that next, but those would be  
21 more for a nationwide geographic use. That would  
22 give us enough for a re-use plan.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think then we would be looking at  
2 these others that could be aggregated, would  
3 actually be your on-scene. So they may either be 50  
4 KHz or in special cases aggregated to 100 or 150  
5 KHz.

6 That was the thinking. Obviously, it's  
7 a proposal, and we're here to listen to anything  
8 else about it, too.

9 Any other comments?

10 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: One of the things  
11 we wanted to do was to make expansion available in  
12 the future without having to go back and remove any  
13 restrictions that we would have initially placed.  
14 So we were trying to promote some flexibility. If  
15 100 and 150 KHz opportunities come down the road, we  
16 won't have to revisit or undo some previously-  
17 applied restrictions. So that was our intent for  
18 providing some flexibility.

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, is there  
20 anybody that has opposition to this or doesn't like  
21 it or wants to change anything?

22 (No response.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I don't see any. So I'll say we have  
2 consensus on this plan to bring it forward to the  
3 Steering Committee.

4 Appendix B is the next one. Go ahead,  
5 Steve, you can explain that.

6 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: In Appendix B we're  
7 acknowledging the fact that the dedicated PL 156.7  
8 had been established for the 800 NPSPAC  
9 interoperability channels. In 87-112, we're  
10 entertaining the concept of developing a nationwide  
11 PL tone, without which you'll have several of them  
12 across in the country. Inconsistency, as we stated  
13 earlier, we see as being in opposition to  
14 interoperability, where we're entertaining the  
15 concept of when 56.7 is a CTCSS tone as well as \$61F  
16 as the Network Access Code for all interoperability  
17 channels, not just the 800 channels.

18 Comments? Discussion?

19 MR. SCHLIEMAN: The first comment, I  
20 think we should eliminate "DPL" from the text  
21 because that's a proprietary nomenclature. It's  
22 also a different numbering scheme, I believe.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Right.

2 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Just refer to it as the  
3 CTCSS and the NEC.

4 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I guess my  
6 question was on this, that assumes Project 25-type  
7 digital system, if we're going to use the \$61F, is  
8 that correct?

9 MR. SCHLIEMAN: That's also the standard  
10 that has been invoked in 700.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right, but not in  
12 the rest of the bands.

13 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN: Do we want to  
15 support that as the Interoperability Subcommittee?

16 MR. SCHLIEMAN: If you're going to have  
17 digital communications, you have to have a standard.  
18 If you don't have a standard, you don't have  
19 communication.

20 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Those agencies  
21 might really need to know where to go. It doesn't  
22 really make a difference what it is; they just need

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to have it. They need to be able to know where to  
2 go when they do migrate to it. So I guess it is  
3 just, once again, education and awareness is  
4 probably going to solve most of our problems here.

5 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Well, if FLEWUG has  
6 submitted a petition for rulemaking, should the NCC,  
7 should we ask the Steering Committee to support  
8 that?

9 MR. WILHELM: I think that would be a  
10 reasonable request.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So any discussion  
12 on that? I think that needs to also go to probably  
13 the Technical Committee also?

14 MR. NASH: Dave Nash, Chairman of the  
15 Technology Subcommittee.

16 The only way we stated it was that, if  
17 digital communications are used on those lower  
18 bands, then it shall follow the Project 25 standard.

19 However, recognizing that most systems in those  
20 bands currently are deployed using analog FM, that  
21 at this point in time it is necessary to maintain,  
22 to allow analog FM to also be used for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interoperability purposes on those lower channels.

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I guess my  
3 question, then, is: Should we -- I know last time  
4 when we went all through this, the Interoperability  
5 Subcommittee just recommended that digital --  
6 actually, the standards came out of the Technical  
7 Subcommittee.

8 But we do have an issue here: To make  
9 interoperability work, we need a standard for  
10 digital. I think what we should do is probably just  
11 recommend it to your Committee and let you bring it  
12 forward as to which standard, which obviously would  
13 be the Project 25.

14 MR. NASH: Sure, and, again, as I said,  
15 I think the discussion was that, if there are  
16 reasons to go to that, then you should implement  
17 Project 25 for interoperability

18 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: If FLEWUG has  
19 submitted a petition, then I suppose we should be  
20 supporting that one way or the other. One of our  
21 subcommittees should be bringing that forward to the  
22 Steering Committee to support that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. NASH: We can come forward with  
2 that.

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

4 MR. NASH: That's fairly easy. Again,  
5 analog, FM, conventional operating on a 20 KHz  
6 channel, and I believe there has been discussion of  
7 adopting the 156.7 CTCSS tone that has been made  
8 common in a couple of the channels.

9 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes. So we're  
10 willing to do that. Okay, I am just going to ask  
11 you to bring that up at your Committee meeting.

12 Go ahead, Dave.

13 MR. PICKERAL: David Pickeral,  
14 supporting the PSWIN program.

15 I just wanted to remark, too, that in  
16 terms of that petition, which is still outstanding  
17 by the FLEWUG, the PSWIN program has also filed  
18 comments to that petition indicating support for P25  
19 as basically the interoperability standard for those  
20 bands. So there's a PSWIN position on the record  
21 saying essentially the same thing right now.

22 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SORLEY: I want to go back to  
2 something you originally said about the code, the  
3 connect tone, whatever you call it.

4 In our area we are negotiating with our  
5 state system to ask them to allow us to put a  
6 satellite tone on their base stations to allow for  
7 local interoperability. I'm just wanting to make  
8 sure that, by us recommending this standard be  
9 established, that we're not precluding a second  
10 connect tone for a local area. It just makes  
11 network efficiency.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: No, I don't think  
13 so because at least what I had in mind was following  
14 what was done at 800, which is exactly that. It is  
15 you have to 156, but you can have additional for  
16 local things, too.

17 MR. SORLEY: I just want to make sure  
18 whatever language you use doesn't preclude that.

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes, we'll make  
20 sure that we do that. That's a good point.

21 Go ahead, Dave.

22 MR. EIERMAN: David Eierman, Motorola.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think Glen said the channels were 20  
2 KHz. I thought that had to be a VHF or narrowband.  
3 Today we have digitally-controlled radios. I am not  
4 so sure that you absolutely, positively have to have  
5 the same PL tone.

6 Back when we only had a couple of PL  
7 readings on the radio, it was fairly important to  
8 establish a nationwide, but on some of these  
9 channels you may already have a nationwide PL tone;  
10 I don't know. If they don't, then picking one  
11 doesn't matter.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: No, they don't.  
13 If one is going to be picked, at least it would be  
14 programmed in.

15 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: And if 156.7 -- we  
16 don't want to undo any familiarity that's been  
17 developed through the 87.112 proceeding.

18 In addition, Appendix B also refers to  
19 incident command and the usage of incident command,  
20 plain speech, some of the ICS parameters we're  
21 familiar with with regard to using channels as well,  
22 which is more of a recommendation than operational

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 standard or mechanism, but we hope something like  
2 that could also be implemented at the local level.

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes, we weren't  
4 going to ask that that get put into the rules.

5 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: No, but we would  
6 like that to be a recommendation, and we would like  
7 that, with some of the websites, some of the  
8 awareness tools we could use. We think that would  
9 improve interoperability in the local regions.

10 Any other discussion?

11 MR. SCHLIEMAN: There's one comment at  
12 the end of Appendix B in the bullets about ICS. I  
13 thought there was a threshold to differentiate  
14 routine, day-to-day interoperability from major --  
15 this doesn't seem to reflect any of that.

16 I don't remember what the wording was.

17 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: It's a PSWIN  
18 definition I believe.

19 MR. SCHLIEMAN: I'm trying to  
20 reconstruct my hard drive. I was just looking back  
21 through to see if I could find some of the stuff  
22 that we're talking about.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But there was a threshold with regard to  
2 when the ICS would kick in as a recommended  
3 requirement.

4 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Outside of 700?

5 MR. SCHLIEMAN: No, that was at 700, and  
6 I think it should be consistent because this I can  
7 speak to because in law enforcement we use  
8 interstate police. That is used for day-to-day  
9 activity, along with some state channels that are  
10 used for interoperability that are not FCC-  
11 designated.

12 ICS is something that should kick in  
13 when there is a major event

14 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: What you are  
15 talking about is establishing the threshold --

16 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: -- and when it  
18 should be mandated?

19 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Yes, some reasonably  
20 flexible wording there that can accommodate the  
21 variations that would occur from one state to  
22 another.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1                   CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I think this last  
2 part, talking about the ICS, it's probably our  
3 recommendation to the Implementation Committee and  
4 let them deal with that part of it, but Bob is  
5 correct because you will have a hassle if you have  
6 Officer A talking to Officer B to establish ICS  
7 before they can go over to the channel.

8                   CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: With some  
9 exceptions, we're pretty comfortable with most of  
10 the interoperability definitions that have been  
11 established at 700 applying over, this being one of  
12 them. There are some exceptions, obviously, with  
13 the mature bands that these new channels are in, but  
14 for the most part we would like to see some  
15 consistency between the bands.

16                  CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Any more  
17 discussion on that? Does anybody have any  
18 opposition or problems with this Appendix B, then,  
19 as we have explained it and modified it?

20                         (No response.)

21                   Okay, then I'm going to consider we have  
22 consensus on that also then.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Do you have anything more, Steve?

2 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: No.

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: That was it?

4 Okay.

5 The last item is the common addressing  
6 for the low-speed data. Actually, it would apply  
7 also to high-speed data because we're going to need  
8 the same thing.

9 We have informally gone ahead and  
10 approached NPSTC to see if they would like to take  
11 on the task of keeping a database. Actually, a  
12 couple of things have to occur if we're going to  
13 make this work nationwide. It's based on a paper we  
14 put together a while back, "Low-Speed Data Operating  
15 Modes and Addressing."

16 But, to make it work, obviously, all the  
17 new data stuff is based on Internet protocol. So  
18 that you can have a common address, e-mail address,  
19 you need a common domain name, which we're proposing  
20 to be ps.gov. Some organization that is ongoing --  
21 it can't be NCC because NCC is going to go away --  
22 has to take that on and apply for that domain name.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We also need a block, a Class B block of  
2           Internet addresses that can be apportioned out to  
3           each of the state SIECs. Anyway, the actual IP  
4           addressing has to be apportioned out, so that they  
5           can be assigned to units that come up on the  
6           interoperability channels.

7           Essentially, once you have done that,  
8           that gets the mechanism so that one unit -- just  
9           because you have common hardware compatibility, if  
10          the software compatibility and this addressing isn't  
11          there, then the units still aren't going to talk to  
12          each other if they come in out of area.

13          If, say, an Arizona unit comes into  
14          California, if you don't have this set up, all he  
15          has in is his local IP address and his local domain  
16          name available, the system in California won't know  
17          how to handle him. Unless it is all set up in a  
18          database ahead of time, it is loaded into the  
19          servers that are going to have to be built to serve  
20          these systems, none of this is going to work.

21          So we have been trying to find someone  
22          that could handle that. It's a big job. The word I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 got back from the folks that were at the NPSTC  
2 meeting yesterday was that they are a little  
3 concerned whether they have the resources to handle  
4 that or not. I think we need to continue working  
5 with them. Maybe we can get it to the point where  
6 they are just simply applying for the domain name  
7 and the IP address, and then providing some database  
8 service, but most of the work of actually putting it  
9 together goes out to the states to implement as part  
10 of their interoperability plans.

11 So I would like some comments on those  
12 thoughts from anybody? Or if anybody has some  
13 better ideas of how to get this done, but none of  
14 this mobile data interoperability is going to work  
15 without some common addressing, as I see it, unless  
16 somebody else knows something or has some other  
17 ideas.

18 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: We had discussed  
19 earlier the gargantuan task of managing such a  
20 database. When we kind of merged the concept of the  
21 SIECs, it made it much more manageable when it can  
22 be at a local/state level with regard -- granted, it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is still going to be significant in most areas, but  
2 certainly it might be a little more feasible if it  
3 is done at the state level with regard to  
4 maintaining and updating and assigning addresses or  
5 domain names to equipment then from the national  
6 scope, which is fairly enormous.

7 I think the SIEC implementation would be  
8 -- this would be another benefit of increased SIEC  
9 exposure and awareness with regard to  
10 interoperability.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Does anyone have  
12 any comments on that?

13 MR. PALMER: Clark Palmer, Washington  
14 State Patrol.

15 I agree with the idea of regionalization  
16 through the SIEC. It will be a very complicated  
17 issue, even for states or regions to do because,  
18 depending on your system, you might control access  
19 to your system. So all systems within the state  
20 would have to -- there needs to be some language  
21 that you will allow IP addresses within a certain  
22 block in your system.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Then the regions will also have to  
2                   address firewall and security issues.

3                   CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN:   Exactly, yes.  
4                   That's the whole range of issues.   This is the only  
5                   thing that so far we have been able to think up to  
6                   get on the road to solving those.

7                   This isn't an issue that has to go to  
8                   the FCC, but what I would recommend, then, right now  
9                   is that we go back and keep working with NPSTC and  
10                  see if they can, given the modification to push a  
11                  lot of the work down to the state level, that they  
12                  essentially just become the common database, much  
13                  like the pre-coordination database, where the real  
14                  work is being done at the region level and it is  
15                  being inputted into the common database from the  
16                  regional level.   I think that might take enough of  
17                  the load off.

18                  So, unless there is a problem, I think  
19                  that is what -- at least I would like to ask for the  
20                  consensus on that, that we go forward on that basis.

21                  Then maybe by next meeting we can come back and see  
22                  if we've got a deal with NPSTC to do that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: I think a good  
2 start would just be reserving the domain, the ps.gov  
3 domain name, would be a step in the right direction,  
4 at least for the time being.

5                   CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes.

6                   MR. PALMER: Clark Palmer, Washington  
7 State Patrol, again.

8                   I agree also, depending on your system  
9 design, you might be dynamically assigning IP  
10 addresses.

11                  CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes.

12                  MR. PALMER: So units, for example, a  
13 particular patrol car might have several different  
14 IP addresses for a region.

15                  CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. Yes,  
16 that's why we are proposing that the blocks, that a  
17 Class B Internet block be applied for, and then that  
18 could be apportioned out to the states.

19                  MR. PALMER: And the SIECs would then  
20 have to apportion per agency a block?

21                  CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes.

22                  MR. PALMER: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. Any more  
2 discussion? Anybody have any opposition to that  
3 recommendation?

4 (No response.)

5 Okay, then we'll go forward with that  
6 also.

7 Is there anybody here who can speak on  
8 TIA's behalf? I don't see John here.

9 My understanding is from the e-mail that  
10 was sent out, TIA has voted now to accept the SAM as  
11 the architecture for the wideband standards, which  
12 basically that part needs to be taken up with Glen's  
13 Technology Subcommittee, but I'm sure, at least from  
14 an interoperability standpoint, that is good news  
15 for us. There's a standard out there now. Portions  
16 of it have been balloted, and I'm sure they'll be  
17 balloting the rest of it soon. So possibly we can  
18 go ahead through Glen's group and get that to the  
19 Steering Committee, to support that, and get that  
20 put into the rules.

21 The other issue, and this isn't strictly  
22 just interoperability, but there is wideband loading

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 standards. I think that is probably more  
2 appropriate to move that to the Technology  
3 Subcommittee also, through Glen's group. He has  
4 some ideas there.

5 We also have an issue -- we don't have a  
6 lot of information yet on re-use factors and things  
7 like that. So there's still a lot of that going on,  
8 but I just wanted to touch on that. It doesn't  
9 necessarily fit in within our operability, but it is  
10 somewhat related, and it sure does fit in with just  
11 the general use of the wideband channels. So that  
12 is something for both Glen on the technical side,  
13 and then the operational side would be the  
14 Implementation Subcommittee.

15 With that, I don't have anything else,  
16 unless someone else does.

17 MR. WILHELM: David, we've been through  
18 a number of proposed recommendations, some of which  
19 would go to the FCC, others which would just be  
20 advisory information from the NCC. If you could put  
21 each of those together as a set of resolutions to  
22 the Steering Committee tomorrow --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

2 MR. WILHELM: -- and if you need help in  
3 printing the document or copying it, we can provide  
4 that.

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Would you like us  
6 just to separate them into different papers for the  
7 different things?

8 MR. WILHELM: Yes. I mean you have some  
9 clearly separable issues. The PL tone is one issue.  
10 The nomenclature is another. If you could separate  
11 those, I would appreciate it.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, we'll work  
13 on that. I think we should be able to do it.

14 MR. WILHELM: You mentioned TIA. John  
15 Oblak will be making a presentation on TIA's  
16 progress in adopting the wideband standard. The  
17 physical standard has been developed, and he will  
18 give us a description of what it is and the work  
19 remaining.

20 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, real good.

21 Is there any other discussion on any  
22 interoperability issue before we adjourn?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (No response.)

2 Okay, we're done, and I guess Glen is  
3 next with Technology. We will take a few minutes  
4 break to let him set up.

5 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Thank you.

6 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went  
7 off the record at 10:04 a.m. and went back on the  
8 record at 10:20 a.m.)

9 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Glen has agreed  
10 to let me have a few minutes here to open up the  
11 Interoperability meeting again to address some  
12 concerns.

13 I guess I'll go ahead start with Glen.  
14 He is one who had a concern and also Ron Haraseth.  
15 So go ahead, Glen.

16 MR. NASH: This is Glen Nash.

17 What I noted in this proposal was that,  
18 relative to the 150 channels, it starts out as  
19 being, for instance, 1TAC1. but as I looked at  
20 that, a "one" can look an awful lot like an "i,"  
21 particularly on the small screens of a portable  
22 radio. We already have ITACs as being the 800 MHz

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NTSPAC interoperability channels. So there is some  
2 concern that we may have confusion between the 800  
3 MHz ITACs and the 150 MHz ITACs as they appear on  
4 the screens.

5 Therefore, I was going to suggest that  
6 something other than "one" be used for the 150  
7 channels. I suggested perhaps the numeral "5," but  
8 the reality is we could name it a lot of things.

9 The other thing that came up during the  
10 discussions was that there are other legacy, if you  
11 will, interoperability channels, and in many areas  
12 of the country there already are conventions on how  
13 to name those. In particular, the 154.280 is  
14 allocated nationwide for fire interoperability.

15 At least my experience has been that the  
16 fire community commonly calls that fire "white." I  
17 can't say that that is true nationwide, but, again,  
18 the places I'm familiar with, that's a common  
19 terminology. I don't think we're going to get them  
20 to change what they call that channel, no matter  
21 what we tell them to do. So how do we deal with  
22 some of those legacies?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           There also are national police channels  
2           that have been set up; 155.475 comes to mind. I  
3           think there's one or two others. I'm not so sure  
4           the police community has been as standard in naming  
5           that. I'm trying to think.

6           NAOMARS is the most common. Some places  
7           they have put the "gold" terminology to it, but it's  
8           more commonly known just as NAOMARS.

9           To set a national standard is fine, but  
10          I think we need to be concerned about the legacies  
11          that are out there.

12          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Go ahead, Steve.

13          CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Steve Devine.

14          I wonder if maybe we ought to take this  
15          on two tracks. The most recent initiative by the  
16          Commission has been to initiate, as they did in 700,  
17          multi-discipline or non-discipline-specific  
18          interoperability channels via the VTEC and UTEC; 700  
19          and 800 are all within that scope. Maybe we ought  
20          to make this into two tracks instead of one to  
21          better address some of the issues unique to the  
22          legacy intersystem sharing channels, because there's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some simple applications that could be done for  
2 both, but when you combine them into one, it becomes  
3 more complex. Maybe we can address those and  
4 acknowledge they're multi-discipline versus  
5 intradiscipline.

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, I am  
7 wondering, as I think about it, it seems to me we  
8 need a common name. I mean you can take any of  
9 these, 155.34, in California it's known as "here."  
10 Probably nobody else would have a clue what that is.

11 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: We've got to have  
12 one nationwide then.

13 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But at least if  
14 there is a standard, and we need to address the  
15 concern that Glen came up with, and I know Ron has  
16 some concerns about even some of the 700, being able  
17 to decode it. But I'm not so sure it's just not  
18 more of, if it is a standard name, whether you use  
19 it or not locally, at least you could get to the  
20 point where this is the common name.

21 If somebody from out of the area comes  
22 in that's not used to that name or color, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       whatever, they could give the standard name out to  
2       those units, and they should be able to access a  
3       card or some information that they have with them  
4       that tells them where to go to.

5               I suppose you could do it by frequency,  
6       but that doesn't always work, either, because not  
7       everyone is tuned into frequency, but everyone  
8       understands names.

9               MR. NASH: Part of what we need to be  
10       concerned about here is that the intent of the name  
11       is for the end-user. It's not for us engineers. We  
12       engineers think "frequency" is okay. So we really  
13       need to be trying to get -- and maybe that's what we  
14       need, you know, is some input from the user  
15       community as to what they think the naming ought to  
16       be.

17              It has to be user-friendly. Otherwise,  
18       they are not going to be able to relate to it, let  
19       alone actually use it.

20              CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Go ahead, Ron.

21              MR. HARASETH: Ron Haraseth.

22              As you say, somebody was saying, it has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to roll easily off the tongue and easy to remember  
2 and recall. That's why you have some of these  
3 acronyms and stuff in the local areas.

4 For those established frequencies below  
5 470, as we indicated, the common denominator is the  
6 frequency itself. I think if we provide any other  
7 name for it, that name is only going to be usable  
8 for those states, SIECs, whatever, that come on  
9 board and create new interoperability functionality  
10 within their area. Then they would have a name that  
11 they could use.

12 But even then, it is going to be a  
13 requirement, and this is one of the things that the  
14 SIEC information website, whatever, should promote,  
15 and through the SIECs, that anybody that has any  
16 potential for traveling to any other area needs to  
17 be aware of what frequencies they have, what they  
18 call it, and what it is.

19 A common denominator, as an engineer, is  
20 the frequency itself. As we were discussing  
21 earlier, it is easy to establish those names as a  
22 common thing, easy for people in the new bands, 700

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 and 800, and we've done that, but it is going to be  
2 very, very difficult to do that in the lower bands.

3 I'm not totally convinced myself that we  
4 even need names for the frequencies below 470. Just  
5 use the channel itself as the common denominator  
6 there.

7 MR. NASH: Well, I would tend to  
8 disagree with you on that point, Ron. Again, having  
9 taken a look at a number of after-action reports, we  
10 find that the end-user says they did not have common  
11 channels. When you get back and you look at their  
12 radios, they, in fact, did. It's just that they had  
13 all named them differently, and so they did not  
14 recognize that they had common channels.

15 MR. HARASETH: They do, but, of course,  
16 that's dependent upon them naming it the same thing.  
17 If they have different names right now, what is the  
18 common denominator by which they will know that they  
19 have those?

20 MR. NASH: And that comes down to having  
21 a national standard for naming of the  
22 interoperability channels. I am just a little

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concerned here that we are trying to go back and  
2 name things that in some cases do have other names  
3 that have been fairly nationally accepted. So now  
4 we are trying to change 40 years of culture.

5 MR. HARASETH: Right.

6 MR. NASH: And I am not sure we are  
7 going to be successful in doing that. As I look at  
8 some of these names, I am not sure that they will  
9 roll off the tongue that well.

10 MR. HARASETH: Yes. Carrying that  
11 thought forward, and with the naming convention,  
12 there's been a lot of thought going into this and  
13 they're relatively established. But, as I was  
14 mentioning up there, the other reason I'm here is my  
15 thought perhaps is to codify that name in such a way  
16 that it can be decoded, very similar to an emission  
17 designator right now in the FCC rules, where the  
18 first character stands for -- has a list: 1, 2, 3,  
19 4, B, H, whatever it might be, that might be the  
20 band indicator. The second digit would be the  
21 discipline-specific, like "M" for "med" and --

22 MR. NASH: That's what this proposal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 does.

2 MR. HARASETH: Right, but just make sure  
3 that that is consistent throughout that whole block  
4 some way and that we include that descriptor of how  
5 that is decoded somewhere in the documentation.

6 MR. SCHLIEMAN: In that regard, if I  
7 might comment, I notice that in the law enforcement  
8 3946 begins with a "3," and 4588 begins with what, a  
9 "3"? That would be confusing, and especially if 155  
10 begins with a "1." You would think that the lower  
11 channels would begin with a lower number.

12 Speaking to that codifying scheme, I  
13 think there's some merit to having a table that is  
14 in some linear, logical fashion.

15 MR. NASH: It is arbitrary in reality.

16 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Well, I suppose you  
17 could make that argument, but it's not logical to  
18 jump around like that.

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Would it be  
20 better if we tabled this and bring it back to the  
21 next meeting?

22 MR. NASH: I would suggest we do. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would further suggest what we really need here is  
2 input from the user community. Perhaps we need to  
3 make a specific request of the representatives on  
4 the Steering Committee from IACP and IAFC that they  
5 get their constituents involved in this, because  
6 those are the people, as I say, they are the ones  
7 that have to be satisfied. They are the ones that  
8 have to use this. We techies are not the guys that  
9 are going to be using this.

10 CHAIRPERSON DEVINE: Steve Devine, State  
11 of Missouri.

12 The real problem when looking at this  
13 is, referencing Bob's suggesting using "4," low  
14 band, of course, then that was encumbering the UHF  
15 interoperable channels. You are talking about  
16 competing legacy channel nomenclature with new  
17 channels. That is what gets difficult because the  
18 new channels, you could do those relatively easily;  
19 it is the embedded use with the legacy intersystem  
20 sharing channels that really complicates matters.  
21 Maybe we need to address those differently, but  
22 there should be standardized names, maybe perhaps

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not the same convention.

2 MR. EIERMAN: David Eierman, Motorola.

3 As part of the Implementation  
4 Subcommittee, my concern is we've only got  
5 theoretically two more meetings of this. As I  
6 mentioned before, there are four documents in the  
7 Guidelines which then get repeated in the document  
8 that NPSTC is publishing that need to be finalized  
9 and updated to any changes made here.

10 I don't mind tabling it. It's just that  
11 it delays finalizing the Guidelines.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I hear your  
13 concern. I am just concerned that, boy, we've got  
14 one chance to get it right, and if we don't, it is  
15 going to be messed up for quite a while. If what we  
16 think is good doesn't turn out to be good, it is  
17 going to be hard to undo.

18 Go ahead, Marilyn.

19 MS. WARD: Marilyn Ward, NPSTC Chair.

20 Glen, you're right on on this topic. I  
21 would like to just kind of tell you what our Region  
22 has been going through. We have like seven counties

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in central Florida. The Governor has created a Task  
2 Force for Terrorism, and I chair that group.

3 This was one of our No. 1 items to  
4 discuss within our region because we have been  
5 trying to get our Regional Planning Committee to do  
6 a statewide, everybody-use-the-same-nomenclature.  
7 That hasn't happened. So in our Region we said  
8 let's amongst ourselves agree.

9 After three hours at one meeting and  
10 then three hours at another meeting, we found this  
11 was a very difficult topic to resolve. We have  
12 users, exactly what Glen said, we have had actual  
13 cases where users have responded to scenes and not  
14 known what the other guys call it.

15 In Volusia County they call it the  
16 "hailing channel." We call it "mutual aid  
17 channels." Some people call them "calling  
18 channels." This is within seven counties, not  
19 nationwide.

20 So I agree that we need a nationwide  
21 standard. I think that somebody's got to make these  
22 decisions. We need to keep the users in mind, and I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would second Glen's request to bring users in and do  
2 it quickly, because, like Dave says, I agree with  
3 that also, we do have a time constraint.

4 But nobody from the user community cares  
5 what frequency they're on. They don't care what  
6 band they're in. They don't care about any of that  
7 stuff. All they want is something that will fit in  
8 their radio that is something that they can think of  
9 from an operational perspective, what channel do  
10 they go to. Whether it be "hailing," "calling,"  
11 "mutual aid," whatever the channel is, we need to be  
12 thinking like the guys on the road.

13 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Marilyn, let me  
14 ask you a question. If we come up with this  
15 standardized, even if we revise what we've got here,  
16 but it gets kind of imposed from this level down, do  
17 you think that that would help in your situation  
18 bringing everybody together? They're kind of faced  
19 with, well, this is the name nationwide, now we  
20 don't have to argue with it, or would there still be  
21 problems that would come up?

22 MS. WARD: The discussion with our group

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is that there is no nationwide standard. People  
2 have been asking for a nationwide standard. We want  
3 the FCC to bless the nationwide standard.

4 Absent that, then we have pockets of  
5 groups that are parading their own individual deals.

6 Now in our State, our Governor's Office has  
7 recognized what we're doing in our Region and has  
8 now asked for us to go ahead and chair a statewide  
9 group and have these discussions.

10 So we hope within our State now -- what  
11 we've come up with is very different. Carlton Wells  
12 brought your 700 recommendation from the State  
13 perspective to our meeting, and the users in the  
14 room didn't like it. They completely changed. They  
15 wanted to use mutual aid and the hailing channels  
16 and these things that the people on the road would  
17 understand.

18 That was frustrating because I  
19 understand the logic of using sevens, and then  
20 Carlton wanted to use eights in front of the 800  
21 groups, and then that would be easy for us who care  
22 about that stuff to make a difference.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           A fireman that's going to a scene could  
2       care less what frequency he is using as long as he  
3       can talk to the guys that are coming to help him.  
4       So that's the perspective that I hope that we keep  
5       as we go through this process and we bring users in  
6       to have these discussions.

7           But, yes, I think they would adopt it if  
8       we would get the FCC to make it be a nationwide  
9       standard.

10           MR. NASH: If I can paraphrase something  
11       that Marilyn said yesterday, again, I think in this  
12       case it does need to be a national standard. By not  
13       having a national standard, we open up a door for  
14       the naysayers at a local level to say, "Well, if we  
15       name it `X' and our neighbor names it `Y,' we have a  
16       problem."

17           Then you say, "Well, then let's do it  
18       regionally," and they say, "Well, if our region  
19       names it `X' and the neighboring region names it  
20       `Y,' we've got a problem."

21           If you say, "Well, let's do it  
22       statewide," then they say, "Well, if our state names

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       it `X' and the neighboring state names it `Y,' we've  
2       got a problem."

3               So the answer is the national standard,  
4       if for no other reason than to shut up the  
5       naysayers.

6               CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Go ahead, Joe.

7               MR. HANNA: Glen just took my line. Joe  
8       Hanna from Directions.

9               In Region 40 we, again, ran through the  
10       same thing that Marilyn has gone through. From  
11       jurisdiction to jurisdiction in the NPSPAC channels  
12       -- I mean we had one city calling it "hailing  
13       channel" and we had one calling it "interrupt  
14       channel," and we had these different nomenclatures.

15               So we tried to put this at a regional  
16       level and we made it standard. Unfortunately, that  
17       really just didn't carry over effectively.

18               I think if you come across with a  
19       national rule, whether you like it or not, then at  
20       least you do have a mandate for everyone to have  
21       that common use.

22               But, again, to reiterate Marilyn's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point, I think you have to stop and think about this  
2 in terms of the guy who is going on the call. To  
3 that firefighter, to that police officer, when you  
4 start going into 1-8-dog, 16-delta, you know,  
5 whatever, they don't understand channels. They  
6 don't understand frequencies. They don't comprehend  
7 800.154/50. They understand there's a talk group or  
8 a name of something that they can use in common  
9 terms.

10 I think that is a critical thing, and  
11 you do have one shot to get it right. Hopefully,  
12 for those people who use it, we can do that for them  
13 on the first pass.

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: What I'm hearing,  
15 obviously, our consensus that we need this hasn't  
16 changed; it's just how to implement it.

17 Go head.

18 MR. PALMER: Clark Palmer, Washington  
19 State Patrol.

20 A national standard is a very good idea.  
21 For us that have large systems, it's difficult to  
22 get agreement just within your system or parts of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the State. Then if you roll it up between multiple  
2 agencies in the State, you can't agree. Then if you  
3 take it to a region level, you're still going to  
4 have the same problems.

5 If a standard is declared quickly, we  
6 can begin the education process within the agencies  
7 of changing that 40-year culture. One piece that I  
8 would remind everyone is the 40-year culture has had  
9 problems. So we need to go to a common naming  
10 structure.

11 People are not going to be happy,  
12 regardless of what we do. So we just need to  
13 declare a standard, make it an easy name, and then  
14 we'll just move forward from there at a state level.

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay, well, let's  
16 go ahead and we'll table the actual what the names  
17 are. We'll just report out that there's consensus  
18 that we need a nationwide, that we need a little  
19 more time though to make sure that we've got it  
20 right, and that we've got the best name that we can  
21 come up with, given all the constraints when you  
22 start naming things across all the bands and all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       that, all those different issues.

2               We will come back next meeting with a  
3       revised proposal. We will try to get input from the  
4       users. We will also ask IACP and the fire folks to  
5       give us some input also.

6               Does that sound like a good approach to  
7       everyone? Okay, then that's what we'll go with.

8               We'll adjourn Interoperability again,  
9       and I'll turn it over to Glen.

10              (Whereupon, the proceedings of the  
11       Interoperability Subcommittee were concluded at  
12       10:41 a.m.)